

**NOTICE OF DECISION**  
**CITY OF WOODBURN, OREGON**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION**

**FILE NUMBERS:** DR 2010-03, EXCP 2010-03, and PLA 2010-01

**DATE OF DECISION:** June 10, 2010

**APPLICANT:** Farmworker Housing Development Corporation

**PROPERTY OWNER:** Willamette Valley Law Project

**LOCATION OF SUBJECT PROPERTY:** The property is located at 356 Young Street and can be identified on Marion County Tax Assessor's maps as tax lots 051W18AB11200 and 051W18AB11100.

**SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL:** The applicant requested a Design Review for a 3,000 square foot office and multi-use building, an Exception to Street Right-of-Way and Improvement Requirements for Young Street and C Street, and a Consolidation of Lots to combine two existing parcels into one and adjust existing lot lines.

**SUMMARY OF DECISION:** The Commission approved, subject to conditions of approval.

**EXPIRATION:** The final decision shall expire within one year of the date of the final decision pursuant to Section 4.102.03.D of the Woodburn Development Ordinance unless:

1. A building permit to exercise the right granted by the decision has been issued;
2. The activity approved in the decision has commenced; or
3. A time extension, *Section 4.102.04*, has been approved.

**APPEAL RIGHTS:** The decision of the Woodburn Planning Commission is final unless appealed to the Woodburn City Council. An appeal stays a decision until the conclusion of the appeals process. A notice of intent to appeal must be received in writing, with the appropriate appeal fee, by the Director of Economic and Development Services within 12 days from the date this notice was mailed. Appeals must comply with the requirements of Section 4.102.01 of the Woodburn Development Ordinance.

A copy of the decision is available for inspection at no cost and a copy will be provided at a reasonable cost at Woodburn City Hall, Department of Economic and Development Services, 270 Montgomery Street, Woodburn, OR 97071. If you have any questions or need additional information regarding appeals, please contact Don Dolenc, Associate Planner at (503) 980-2431.

**DATE OF MAILING:** June 25, 2010

**IN THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF WOODBURN, OREGON**

<b>DR 2010-03</b>	)	
<b>EXCP 2010-03</b>	)	<b>FINAL ORDER</b>
<b>PLA 2010-01</b>	)	

**WHEREAS**, a request was made by Willamette Valley Law Project, property owner, for a Design Review for a 3,000 square foot office and multi-use building, an Exception to Street Right-of-Way and Improvement Requirements for Young Street and C Street, and a Consolidation of Lots to combine two existing parcels into one and adjust existing lot lines, and;

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Commission reviewed the matter at the meeting of June 10, 2010 and;

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Commission considered the written and oral testimony presented by staff and the applicant, and;

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Commission closed the hearing, and;

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Commission moved to approve case numbers DR 2010-03, EXCP 2010-03, and PLA 2010-01 and instructed staff to prepare findings and conclusions,

**NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED BY THE COMMISSION:**

The Planning Commission approves case numbers DR 2010-03, EXCP 2010-03, and PLA 2010-01 based on the findings and conclusions contained in Exhibit "A", and subject to the conditions of approval contained in Exhibit "B", which are attached hereto and by reference incorporated herein and which the Planning Commission finds reasonable.

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

Ellen Bandelow, Chairperson

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

June 24, 2010

## FINAL ORDER EXHIBIT A

### **APPROVAL CRITERIA**

Applicable criteria from the Woodburn Development Ordinance (WDO) are Sections: 1.101 – Structure, 1.102 – Definitions, 2.106 – Commercial General (CG) District Standards, 3.101 – Street Standards, 3.102 – Utilities and Easements, 3.103 – Setback, Open Space and Lot Standards, Generally, 3.104 – Access, 3.105 – Off Street Parking and Loading, 3.106 – Landscaping Standards, 3.107 – Architectural Design Guidelines and Standards, 3.110 – Signs, 4.101 – Decision Making Procedures, 5.101 – Type I Application Requirements, and 5.103 – Type III Application Requirements. Additional relevant criteria are the accessible parking standards of Section 1104 of the Oregon Structural Specialty Code and ORS 447.233 and the standards of the Transportation System Plan (TSP.)

### **ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS OF FACT**

#### *General Provisions*

Findings: Per Table 4.1, Design Reviews for structures 1000 square feet or more and Exception to Street Right-of-Way and Improvement Requirements are Type III decisions. The current application is for a 3,000 square foot building. Per Section WDO 4.101.10.B, the Planning Commission is the City decision-maker for Type III decisions. Consolidation of Lots is a Type I decision. Per Section 4.101.02, the applications are processed following the procedures applicable for the highest type decision requested.

Conclusion: The applications are correctly filed as Type III decisions.

#### *WDO 2.106                      Commercial General (CG) district standards*

Finding: Civic and social organizations are permitted by right under Section 2.106.01.P.11.

Conclusion: The proposed office and meeting building is a conforming use in the CG zone.

Findings: Table 2.1.10 provides that “In a CG zone the lot area for a non-residential use shall be adequate to contain all structures within the required setbacks. There shall be no minimum width or depth.” The proposed building is a nonresidential use. The project plans show the proposed building to be in a conforming location with respect to setbacks.

Conclusion: The proposed lot is conforming in the CG zone.

Findings: Section 2.106.05.B provides that “The maximum height of buildings shall not exceed ... the heights illustrated on Section 6.1 Figure 6.13 for properties in the Gateway subdistrict ....” Figure 6.13 shows the maximum building height to be 40 feet. The building elevations show the building to be approximately 14 feet high, as building height is defined in Section 1.102.

Conclusion: The building is conforming for height in the CG zone, and the Gateway subdistrict.

Findings: Section 2.106.05.C.1.a.1 provides that “The minimum setback abutting a street shall be 15 feet plus any Special Setback, Section 3.103.05.” The project plans show the building to be located 51 feet from the centerline of Young Street (15 feet from the property line after the required right-of-way dedication) and 20 feet from the existing C Street right-of-way (15 feet from the property line after the required right-of-way dedication). The project plans do not show a Special Setback for C Street.

Conclusions: The building meets the required setbacks abutting Young Street and C Street.

Findings: Section 2.106.05.C.1.b.1 provides that “Off street parking, maneuvering and storage shall be prohibited within a required setback EXCEPT for parking, maneuvering and storage adjacent to a wall.” The project plans show parking and maneuvering areas within the setbacks along the south and west property lines. The project plans do not show a wall at those locations. The applicant proposes a joint parking agreement with the lot to the west.

Conclusion: The property owner must provide a wall along those portions of the south property line where the parking lot is within the setbacks.

<b>TABLE 2.1.11 Interior Yard and Buffer Standards CG Zones</b>			
<b>Abutting Property</b>	<b>Landscaping</b>	<b>Wall</b>	<b>Interior Setback</b>
<b>RS, R1S, or RM zone</b>	There is no buffer yard landscaping requirement for an interior yard abutting a buffer wall.	Solid brick or architectural wall with anti-graffiti surface, no less than 6 feet or greater than 7 feet in height.	10 ft.
<b>CO, CG, DDC, NNC, P/SP, IP, SWIR or IL zone</b>	There is no buffer yard landscaping requirement for an interior yard abutting a buffer wall.	Alternative A: Wall requirements shall be determined in conjunction with the applicable Design Review process. Alternative B: No wall required.	Alternative A: 5 ft.  Alternative B: Zero setback abutting a building wall.

Findings: Table 2.1.11 sets the side and rear yard requirements in the CG zone. The property abuts land zoned CG and RM. The project plans show the building to be located 5 feet from the west property line and approximately 46’-7” from the south property line.

Conclusion: The building meets the interior setbacks for Alternative A in Table 2.1.11.

Findings: Section 2.106.06.E.3 provides that “Common refuse collection facilities shall be screened on all sides by an architectural block wall and solid gate, both with an anti-graffiti surface, a minimum of six feet and a maximum of seven feet in height.” The project plans do not show refuse collection facilities. The property owner has indicated that the proposed building will share refuse collection facilities with the adjacent PCUN building, and that there will be no refuse collection facility on site.

Conclusion: The proposed development complies with Section 2.105.06.F.3.

### *WDO 3.101*

#### *Street Standards*

Findings regarding Young Street: Young Street is designated as a Minor Arterial in the Transportation System Plan (TSP.) The required cross-section for a Minor Arterial is a 74 foot right-of-way, 36 foot improved driving surface (two 12 foot traffic lanes and a 12 foot center turn lane), 6 foot bike lanes, 6 foot landscape strips and 6 foot sidewalks on both sides. The existing cross-section is a 60 foot right-of-way, improved with (south to north) a 4’ sidewalk, 3½’ planter strip, 6” curb, 21’ paved driving/bike lane, a center stripe, 21’ paved driving/bike lane, 6” curb, 3½’ planter strip, and 4’ sidewalk. The landscaping plan does not show street trees.

Conclusions regarding Young Street: Young Street is a Boundary Street and Connecting Street for the subject property. Young Street does not meet the dedication or improvement requirements of the TSP. The property owner must dedicate an additional 7 feet to right-of-way along the Young Street frontage. The property owner must provide the full street improvements required for Young Street under the TSP or obtain an Exception to Street Right-of-Way and Improvement Requirements.

Findings regarding C Street: C Street is designated as a local residential street in the Transportation System Plan (TSP.) The minimum required cross-section for a local residential street is a 50 foot right-of-way, 24 foot improved driving surface (two 12 foot traffic lanes), 7 foot landscape strips and 5 foot sidewalks on both sides. The existing cross-section is a 40 foot right-of-way, improved with a 2’ curb and gutter, 26’ paved driving surface (no center stripe) and a 2’ curb and gutter.

Conclusions regarding C Street: C Street is a Boundary Street and Connecting Street for the subject property. C Street does not meet the dedication or improvement requirements of the TSP. The property owner must dedicate an additional 5 feet to right-of-way along the C Street frontage. The property owner must provide the full street improvements required for C Street under the TSP or obtain an Exception to Street Right-of-Way and Improvement Requirements.

### *WDO 3.102*

#### *Utilities and Easements*

Findings: Section 3.102.04.B provides that five foot wide public utility easements shall be dedicated along each lot line abutting a public street. The project plans do not show public utility easements.

Conclusion: The property owner shall dedicate a five foot wide public utility easement along the Young Street and C Street frontages, in accordance with Section 3.102.04.B.

*WDO 3.104                      Access*

Findings: Section 3.104.01.B.1 provides that “A City permit shall be required for any new or modified vehicular access to a street that is under City jurisdiction.” The project plans show a new vehicular access off C Street.

Conclusion: An access permit is required.

Findings: Section 3.104.03.A.3.b provides that “Similar, and/or compatible, uses on abutting lots should have interconnected on-site access and parking facilities.” The project plans do not show shared parking or vehicular access. Parking for the adjacent PCUN building is on the west side of that building.

Conclusion: It is impractical to establish interconnected vehicular access and parking facilities.

Findings: Section 3.104.05.E.1.b.1 provides that driveways for commercial uses have a throat and travel lane width of 26 feet minimum, 36 feet maximum. The project plans show a driveway width of 24 feet. The applicant is in the process of redesigning the driveway to comply.

Conclusions: The proposed development does not comply with Section 3.104.05.E.1.b.1. The property owner must provide a driveway width of at least 26 feet.

Findings: Section 3.104.05.E.4 provides that the throat length of a driveway onto a local street, extending from the closest off street parking or loading space to the outside edge of right of way, be a minimum of 20 feet. The project plans show a throat length of 20’-7½” from the current east property line (or 15’-7½” from the east property line after the required right-of-way dedication for C Street.)

Conclusions: The proposed development does not comply with Section 3.104.05.E.4. The property owner must provide a driveway throat length of at least 20 feet.

*WDO 3.105                      Off Street Parking and Loading*

Findings: Table 3.1.2 gives the required for off-street parking ratio. The project plans show 8 off-street parking spaces. The floor plan shows three meeting rooms. The largest meeting room (Room 104) is approximately 608 square feet. The building, minus all three meeting rooms, contains approximately 1,160 square feet. Section 3.105.02.I.2 provides that up to 20 percent of the required vehicle parking may be satisfied by joint use of the parking area that is used for another use that would require the parking during the same peak hours, an additional 20 percent for uses that that would require the parking during alternate peak hours, and an additional 10 percent when the development is located along a transit service route and provides transit related

uses such as stops, pullouts, and shelters. The applicant has proposed to share parking with the abutting PCUN property under a joint-use parking agreement. The property owner reports that the existing PCUN building contains 3,280 square feet of gross floor area devoted to office use, and a 1,478 square foot assembly hall used 15-20 times annually on weekends. An analysis of aerial photography shows that the PCUN properties could accommodate 18 parking spaces (15 standard, 2 compact, 1 accessible) and one loading berth, with the existing nonconformities for setbacks, throat length, screening, and landscaping.

<b>TABLE 3.1.2      Off Street Parking Ratio Standards</b>	
<b>Use</b>	<b>Parking Ratio - spaces per activity unit or square feet of gross floor area (sfgfa)</b>
15.      Offices	1.0/ 350 sfgfa
54.      Meeting facilities	1.0/ 4 seats or 1.0/ 8 feet of bench or 1.0/ 35 sfgfa of the primary assembly room

Conclusions: Room 104 is the primary assembly room. The entire building, minus all three meeting rooms, is office. With a joint-use parking agreement (20% reduction in parking requirement), the proposed building requires 17 off-street parking spaces. The proposed development does not meet the standard of Table 3.1.2. The property owner must provide at least 9 additional off-street parking spaces. With a joint-use parking agreement (20% reduction in parking requirement), the existing PCUN building requires 8 off-street parking spaces during weekday hours. The abutting PCUN properties can provide 9 additional off-street parking spaces for the proposed building.

Findings: Section 3.105.02.D provides that off-street parking spaces may be located on an alternative site from the primary building, structure or use if the alternative site is within 500 feet of the site containing the primary use, if the alternative site is located either in the same use zone, in a more intensive use zone or in a zone where off street parking is allowed as a permitted use, or subject to approval, as a conditional use.

Conclusions: The proposed development does not meet the standard of Table 3.1.2. The property owner must provide 17 off-street parking spaces on the subject property and/or an alternative site in accordance with Section 3.105.02.D.

Findings: Section 3.105.02.E.3 provides that “The number of disabled person vehicle parking spaces shall be provided to the standards of the state Building Code and applicable federal standards.” The state requirements are codified in ORS 447.233.

The number of accessible parking spaces shall be:

Total Parking In Lot	Required Minimum Number of Accessible Spaces
1 to 25	1

[ORS 447.233(2)(a)]

In addition, one in every eight accessible spaces, but not less than one, shall be van accessible. [ORS 447.233(2)(b)]

A van accessible parking space shall be at least nine feet wide and shall have an adjacent access aisle that is at least eight feet wide. [ORS 447.233(2)(b)]

Accessible parking spaces shall be at least nine feet wide and shall have an adjacent access aisle that is at least six feet wide. [ORS 447.233(2)(c)]

The project plans show one accessible space, 9 feet wide by 19 feet long, with an access aisle 8 feet wide.

Conclusion: The proposed development meets the requirements of requirements of ORS 447.233(2)(a) through (c).

Findings: Section 3.105.02.F provides that a maximum of 20 percent of the required vehicle parking spaces may be satisfied by compact vehicle parking spaces. The project plans show one compact vehicle parking space.

Conclusion: The proposed development complies with Section 3.105.02.F.

Findings: Table 3.1.3 sets the minimum dimensions for loading spaces. The proposed building will contain 3,000 square feet of gross floor area. The project plans do not show a loading space. The applicant has proposed to provide a loading space abutting the PCUN property, through a shared parking/loading agreement. County property tax records show the existing PCUN building to be 5,374 square feet in area.

<b>TABLE 3.1.3 Loading Space Requirements</b>				
<b>Use</b>	<b>Minimum No. of Spaces</b>	<b>Minimum Size of Space</b>		
		<b>Width</b>	<b>Length</b>	<b>Height</b>
<b>For all uses other than residential or entirely office use</b> (square feet of gross floor area) 0-9,999	1	12 feet	20	14

Conclusions: The proposed development does not meet the requirements of Table 3.1.3. With a joint-use agreement, the proposed development, together with the existing PCUN building, require one loading space. The property owner shall provide one loading space, in accordance with Table 3.1.3, either on the subject property or on an abutting property, through a shared parking/loading agreement.

Findings: Table 3.1.4 sets the minimum dimensions for parking spaces and drive aisles. The project plans show 90° parking with 6 standard spaces (9 feet wide and 19 feet long), one accessible space, and one compact space (called out as 8 feet wide and 19 feet long). The drive aisle is shown as 24 feet wide.



<b>TABLE 3.1.4      Parking Space and Aisle Dimensions    (See Figure 6.10)</b>						
<b>Aisle</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Width (Measured from the midpoint of the double stripe)</b>	<b>Curb Length</b>	<b>1-Way Aisle Width</b>	<b>2-Way Aisle Width</b>	<b>Stall Depth</b>
90°	Standard	9.0 feet	9.0 feet	24.0 feet	24.0 feet	19.0 feet
	Compact	7.5 feet	7.5 feet	22.0 feet	24.0 feet	15.0 feet

Conclusion: The proposed development complies with Table 3.1.4.

Findings: Section 3.105.02.H.5 provides that “Off street parking and maneuvering areas shall have directional markings and signs to control vehicle movement.” The site plan shows directional pavement markings.

Conclusion: The proposed development complies with Section 3.105.02.H.5.

Findings: Section 3.105.02.H.6 provides that “Off street parking spaces shall be delineated by double parallel lines on each side of a space. The total width of the lines shall delineate a separation of 2 feet.” The site plan shows double parallel stripes.

Conclusion: The proposed development complies with Section 3.105.02.H.5.

Findings: Section 3.105.02.H.10 provides that “All uses required to provide 10 or more off street parking spaces shall provide a bicycle rack within 50 feet of the main entrance. The number of required rack spaces shall be one plus one per ten vehicle parking spaces, with a maximum of 20 rack spaces.” The proposed development requires 17 parking spaces. The project plans show a bicycle rack with three stalls.

Conclusion: The proposed development complies with Section 3.105.02.H.10.

Findings: Section 3.105.02.I.5 provides that joint use parking may be allowed if there is no substantial conflict in the principal operating hours of the buildings or uses, if the parking spaces are located no more than 400 feet from a building or use to be served by the joint use parking, if documentation to the satisfaction of the City Attorney is submitted verifying joint use parking between the separate developments, and if the approved legal documentation is recorded at the Marion County Recorder’s Office.

Conclusion: The property owner must execute a joint use parking agreement that meets the requirements of Section 3.105.02.I.5.

### *WDO 3.106      Landscaping Standards*

Findings: Section 3.106.03.A.2.b.2 provides that “All parking areas abutting a street shall provide a 42-inch vertical visual screen from the abutting street grade.” The landscape plan

shows a bed of “medium” bushes between the parking spaces and C Street. The property owner has indicated that the shrubs will attain a mature height of 42 inches.

Conclusion: proposed development complies with Section 3.106.03.A.2.b.2.

*WDO 3.107 Architectural Design Guidelines and Standards*

Findings: Section 3.107.06.A provides that “The following design guidelines shall be applicable to all non-residential structures and buildings in the RS, R1S, RM, CO, CG and P zones.” The proposed development is an office and multi-use building.

Conclusion: The proposed development is subject to the architectural design guidelines and standards of Section 3.107.

Findings: Section 3.107.06.B.1.a provides that “Building façades visible from streets and public parking areas *should* be articulated in order to avoid the appearance of box-like structures with unbroken wall surfaces.” The exterior elevation drawings show the front façade to have vertical articulation, horizontal articulation, both metal and plaster siding, and windows.

Conclusion: The proposed development meets the guideline of WDO 3.107.06.B.1.a.

Findings: Section 3.107.06.B.1.b provides that “The appearance of exterior walls *should* be enhanced by incorporating three dimensional design features, including the following:

- 1) Public doorways and/or passage ways through the building.
- 2) Wall offsets and/or projections.
- 3) Variation in building materials and/or textures.
- 4) Arcades, awnings, canopies and/or porches.”

The exterior elevation drawings show the front façade to have vertical articulation, horizontal articulation, both metal and plaster siding, and windows.

Conclusion: The proposed development meets the guideline of WDO 3.107.06.B.1.b.

Findings: Section 3.107.06.B.2.a provides that “Building exteriors *should* exhibit finishes and textures that reduce the visual monotony of bulky structures and large structural spaces; enhance visual interest of wall surfaces and harmonize with the structural design.” The exterior elevation drawings show the front façade to have both metal and plaster siding, and windows.

Conclusion: The proposed development meets the guideline of WDO 3.107.06.B.2.a.

Findings: Section 3.107.06.B.2.b provides that “The appearance of exterior surfaces *should* be enhanced by incorporating the following:

- 1) At least 30% of the wall surface abutting a street *should* be glass.
- 2) All walls visible from a street or public parking area *should* be surfaced with wood, brick, stone, designer block, or stucco or with siding that has the appearance of wood lap siding.

- 3) The use of plain concrete, plain concrete block, corrugated metal, plywood, T-111 and sheet composite siding as exterior finish materials for walls visible from a street or parking area *should* be avoided.
- 4) The color of at least 90 percent of the wall, roof and awning surface visible from a street or public parking area should be an “earth tone” color containing 10 parts or more of brown or a “tinted” color containing 10 parts or more white. Fluorescent, “day-glo,” or any similar bright color *should not* be used on the building exterior.”

The north elevation is approximately 12% glass. The west elevation is approximately 8% glass. The exterior elevation drawings show the front façade to have vertical articulation, horizontal articulation, both metal and plaster siding, and windows. The submittal notes that exterior paint colors will be earth tone.

Conclusion: The proposed development meets guidelines 2-4 of WDO 3.107.06.B.2.b, but does not meet guideline number 1.

Findings: Section 3.107.06.B.3 provides that “Multi-planed Roof Guidelines.

- a. The roof line at the top of a structure *should* establish a distinctive top to the building.
- b. The roof line *should not* be flat or hold the same roof line over extended distances. Rather the roof line *should* incorporate variations, such as:
  - 1) Offsets and/or jogs in the plane of the roof.
  - 2) Changes in the height of the exterior wall for flat roof buildings, including parapet walls with variations in elevation and/or cornices.”

The exterior elevation drawings show the front façade to have two visible roof elevations.

Conclusion: The proposed development meets the guideline of WDO 3.107.06.B.3.

Findings: Section 3.107.06.B.4 provides that “All roof-mounted equipment, EXCEPT solar collectors, *should* be screened from view from streets abutting the building site by:

- a. Locating roof mounted equipment below the highest vertical element of the building; or
- b. Screening roof top equipment using materials of the same character as the structure’s basic materials.”

The drawings show no new roof-mounted equipment.

Conclusion: The proposed development meets the guideline of WDO 3.107.06.B.4.

Findings: Section 3.107.06.B.5 provides that “All building faces abutting a street or a public parking area *should* provide weather protection for pedestrians. Features to provide this protection should include:

- a. A continuous walkway at least 8 feet wide along the face of the building utilizing a roof overhang, arcade, awnings and/or canopies.
- b. Awnings and canopies that incorporate the following design features:
  - 1) Angled or curved surfaces facing a street or parking area.
  - 2) A covering of canvas, treated canvas, awning fabric, or matte finish vinyl.
  - 3) A constant color and pattern scheme for all buildings within the same development.

4) No internal back lighting.”

The building plans show a covered area at the main entrance.

Conclusion: The proposed development meets the guideline of WDO 3.107.06.B.5.

Findings: Section 3.107.06.B.6 provides that “The landscaping required by the standards of the WDO *should* be augmented to address site specific visual impacts of abutting uses and the visual character of the surrounding area.” The abutting uses are office, meeting room, parking lot, and residential.

Conclusions: The proposed landscaping is in keeping with the visual character of the surrounding area. The proposed development meets the guideline of WDO 3.107.06.B.6.

Findings: Section 3.107.06.B.10 provides that “Obstruction of existing solar collectors on abutting properties by site development *should* be mitigated.” A site inspection showed no existing solar collectors on abutting properties.

Conclusion: The proposed development meets the guideline of WDO 3.107.06.B.10.

Findings: Section 3.107.06.C.1 provides that “Access to and from the site and circulation within the site *should* separate facilities for cars, trucks and transit from those for bicycles and pedestrians.” The project plans show pedestrian connections to Young Street, C Street, and the adjoining PCUN property. The plan shows a bicycle rack outside the vehicle parking area.

Conclusion: The proposed development meets the guideline of Section 3.107.06.C.1.

Findings: Section 3.107.06.C.2.a.1 provides that “Vehicle access points *should* be identified by accentuated landscaped areas, by entrance throats designed to control access from abutting parking and by monument type entrance signs.” The landscaping plan shows that the parking lot entrance is provided with landscaping and with curbs delineating the throat. The submittal does not address entrance signs.

Conclusion: The proposed development meets the guideline of Section 3.107.06.C.2.a.1.

Findings: Section 3.107.06.C.2.b.1 provides that “The buildings *should* be linked to the sidewalks on abutting streets by internal pedestrian ways. Such pedestrian ways *should* be either raised or delineated by distinctive pavers.” The project plans show pedestrian connections to Young Street, C Street, and the adjoining PCUN property.

Conclusion: The proposed development meets the guideline of Section 3.107.06.C.2.b.1.

Findings: Section 3.107.06.D.1 provides that “Within the prescribed setbacks, building location and orientation *should* compliment abutting uses and development patterns.”

Conclusion: The proposed development meets the guideline of WDO 3.107.06.D.1.

Findings: Section 3.107.06.E provides that “Off street parking between the architectural front of a building and the setback line abutting street *should* be limited to a depth of not more than 130 feet.” The site plan shows no parking between the building and Young Street.

Conclusion: The proposed development meets the guideline of Section 3.107.06.E.

Findings: Section 3.107.06.F.1 provides that “Outdoor storage, when permitted, *shall* be screened from the view of abutting streets by a solid brick or architectural block wall not less than 6, nor more than 9 feet in height.” The site plan does not show an outdoor storage area.

Conclusion: This decision does not authorize outdoor storage.

#### *WDO 3.110 Signs*

Finding: Details of proposed signage were not submitted as part of this Design Review.

Conclusions: This decision does not authorize the installation of signage. Signs must be approved through the sign permit application process.

#### *WDO 5.103 Exception to Street Right of Way and Improvement Requirements*

WDO 5.103.12 requires the applicant to analyze the effect of a proposed development on streets near the development (the boundary streets and connecting streets), and on the larger transportation system.

Subsection C.1 requires an estimate of the extent to which the rights-of-way and improvements will be used by persons served by the building or development.

Findings: The applicant’s analysis was based on the Institute of Traffic Engineers’ Trip Generation Manual. Neither conventional traffic counts, nor the ITE Trip Generation Manual, account for non-vehicular traffic. The sidewalks are required by the Transportation System Plan for safety. The landscape strip is required by the Transportation System Plan as a standard of aesthetics. The specified improvements are needed to provide vehicle and non-motorized transportation facilities throughout the street corridor. Traffic counts from February, 2009 show 5,734 average daily trips on Young Street near the property.

Conclusion: Users of the facility will use Young Street and C Street for both their vehicular and non-motorized traffic needs, for safety as well as convenience. The proposed development will account for approximately a 0.6 percent increase in vehicular trips per day on Young Street.

Subsection C.2 requires an estimate of the of rights-of-way and improvements needed to meet the estimated extent of use by persons served by the development.

Findings: The proposed development will account for approximately a 0.6 percent increase in vehicular trips per day on Young Street. The existing cross-section of Young Street is a 60 foot

right-of-way, improved with (south to north) a 4' sidewalk, 3½' planter strip, 6" curb, 21' paved driving/bike lane, a center stripe, 21' paved driving/bike lane, 6" curb, 3½' planter strip, and 4' sidewalk. The existing cross-section of C Street is a 40 foot right-of-way, improved with a 2' curb and gutter, 26' paved driving surface (no center stripe) and a 2' curb and gutter.

Conclusions: No improvements to Young Street or C Street are needed to accommodate the increase in traffic attributable to the addition to the proposed development. It is reasonable to require the property owner to participate in the cost of providing all improvements required by the Transportation System Plan for Young Street and C Street. The property owner should enter into a nonremonstrance agreement to participate in the cost of reconstructing Young Street and C Street to the standards of the Transportation System Plan when such reconstruction becomes timely.

Subsection C.3 requires an estimate of the impact of the development on the public infrastructure system.

Findings: The impact of the proposed development on the larger public infrastructure system is anticipated to be approximately equal to or less than, the estimated 0.6 percent increase in traffic on Young Street.

Conclusion: No immediate improvements to the larger public infrastructure system are needed to accommodate the increase in traffic attributable to the addition to the armory. System Development Charges (SDC) will be collected, to fund improvements to the larger public infrastructure system.

Subsection C.4 requires an estimate of the of rights-of-way and improvements needed to mitigate the estimated impact on the public infrastructure system.

Findings: The impact of the proposed development on the larger public infrastructure system is anticipated to be approximately equal to or less than, the estimated 0.6 percent increase in traffic on Young Street.

Conclusion: No immediate improvements to the larger public infrastructure system are needed to accommodate the increase in traffic attributable to the addition to the armory. System Development Charges (SDC) will be collected, to fund improvements to the larger public infrastructure system.

Findings: WDO 5.103.12.D provides that no exception may be granted from applicable construction specifications. The applicant has not requested an exception from construction specifications, but rather an exception to the street cross section requirement.

Conclusion: An exception to reduce a street right of way or cross section requirement is not precluded by WDO 5.103.12.D.

Findings: WDO 5.103.12.E requires that rights-of-way meet minimum standards of safety (specified in WDO 3.101.02.D as a 10 foot travel lane in each direction, curbs, and drainage facilities) to be eligible for a street exception. The existing street cross-sections are discussed above.

Conclusions: Both Young Street and C Street meet the specified minimum standards of safety. A street exception is not precluded by Section 5.103.12.E.

Findings: WDO 3.101.02.D.2.a provides that the full right-of-way for the subject street classification is required for a boundary street without an approved exception.

Conclusion: The property owner must dedicate an additional 6 feet to right-of-way along Young Street and 5 feet along C Street, in accordance with WDO 5.103.12.D.2.a.

**Summary of conclusions:** Requiring the applicant to build the boundary and connecting streets to the cross-section specified in the Transportation System Plan would exceed the applicant's proportional share of the public improvements. It is, however, reasonable to require the property owner to bear a portion of the improvement costs for both Young Street and C Street. An exception has been requested for the required improvements to both Young Street and C Street. A non-remonstrance agreement for public improvements could be required as a condition of approval for the street exception.

#### *5.101.07 Property Line Adjustment; Consolidation of Lots*

Findings: Section 5.101.07.A requires that the resulting lot comply with the standards for lot area, depth, width, frontage, building setbacks, vehicular access and lot coverage. It also requires that buildings and uses comply with any previous land use decisions and the state building code and fire code. The proposal is to consolidate two lots into one. Lot standards are discussed previously in this report. The existing building will be demolished as part of the redevelopment of the consolidated lot.

Conclusion: The consolidated lot complies with Section 5.101.07.C.

Findings: Section 5.101.07.D.2 requires that the applicant provide proof of a recorded survey prior to the issuance of any building or other permits that rely on the adjustment.

Conclusion: The property owner must provide the Director with a copy of the recorded consolidation survey prior to the issuance of a building permit, in accordance with Section 5.101.07.D.2.

#### *Overall Conclusion*

The proposed development meets or can meet the requirements of the Woodburn Development Ordinance with appropriate conditions of approval.

## **FINAL ORDER EXHIBIT B**

The Planning Commission approves cases DR 2010-03, EXCP 2010-03, and PLA 2010-01 subject to the following conditions of approval:

1. The property owner shall execute an acceptance of these conditions of approval.
2. The property shall be developed in substantial conformity to the preliminary plans (Exhibits A through D) except as modified by these conditions of approval.
3. The property owner shall submit a revised site plan showing the following:
  - a. a driveway width of at least 26 feet, in accordance with Section 3.104.05.E.1.b.1.
  - b. a driveway throat length of at least 20 feet, in accordance with Section 3.104.05.E.4.
4. The property owner shall execute a joint use parking agreement that meets the requirements of Section 3.105.02.I.5 to share parking and loading spaces with the adjacent PCUN properties.
5. The property owner shall enter into a non-remonstrance agreement with the City to participate in future street improvements to Young Street and C Street.
6. The property owner shall provide the Director with a copy of the recorded consolidation survey prior to the issuance of a building permit, in accordance with Section 5.101.07.D.2. The survey shall show:
  - a. dedication of an additional 7 feet to right-of-way along the Young Street frontage and an additional 5 feet to right-of-way along the C Street frontage, in accordance with the Transportation System Plan.
  - b. dedication of a five foot wide public utility easement along the Young Street and C Street frontages, in accordance with Section 3.102.04.B.

<b>Exhibit "A"</b>	Utility & Demo Plan, Sheet A0.0, dated June 3, 2010
<b>Exhibit "B"</b>	Grading and Landscape Plans, Sheet A0.1, dated June 3, 2010
<b>Exhibit "C"</b>	Floor Plan & Roof Plan, Sheet A1.0, dated April 12, 2010
<b>Exhibit "D"</b>	Exterior Building Elevations, Sheet A3.0, dated April 12, 2010